REMARKS

The Office Action of June 2, 2009 was received and carefully reviewed. Claims 1-3, 7-9, 13, 14, 17 and 18 were pending prior to the instant amendment. By this amendment, claims 1, 7, 13 and 17 are amended. Consequently, claims 1-3, 7-9, 13, 14, 17 and 18 are currently pending in the instant application. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the currently pending rejections are requested for the reasons advanced in detail below.

Claims 1-3, 7-9, 13-14 and 17-18 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sundahl et al. (U.S. Pat. Pub. 2004/0212573 A1) (Sundahl, hereinafter) in view of Ishizuka (U.S. Patent No. 6,479,940 B1) (Ishizuka, hereinafter) and Storino (U.S. Pat. Pub. 2003/0078741 A1). Sundahl, Ishizuka, and Storino, however, fail to render the claimed invention unpatentable. Each of the claims recite a specific combination of features that distinguishes the invention from the prior art in different ways. For example, independent claims 1, 7, 13, and 17 recite a combination that includes, among other things:

> *". . . wherein the display panel, the temperature detection unit, the A/D conversion circuit, the storage unit, the arithmetic operation unit, the count unit and correction unit are formed over a same substrate . . ."*

Support for the aforementioned features is found, at least, in Applicant's originally filed specification, for example, at page 9, lines 16-26 and page 10, line 32 to page 11, line 9. Turning to the cited prior art, Sundahl, the base reference, fails to disclose or fairly suggest the features of the amended claim language. In addition, none of the remaining references discloses the features as recited in independent claims 1, 7, 13, and 17. Accordingly, even if the references are

combined with each other, the display device or the drive method for the display device of present invention is not obtained. Thus, at the very least, the applied references, whether taken alone or in combination, fail to disclose or suggest any of these exemplary features recited in independent claims 1, 7, 13, and 17.

In accordance with the M.P.E.P. § 2143.03, to establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness of a claimed invention, all the claim limitations must be taught or suggested by the prior art. *In re Royka*, 409 F.2d 981, 180 USPQ 580 (CCPA 1974). "All words in a claim must be considered in judging the patentability of that claim against the prior art." In re Wilson, 424 F.2d 1382, 1385, 165 USPQ 196 (CCPA 1970). Therefore, it is respectfully submitted that neither Sundahl, Ishizuka, nor Storino, taken alone or in any proper combination, discloses or suggests the subject matter as recited in claims 1, 7, 13, and 17. Hence, withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

Each of the dependent claims depend from one of independent claims 1, 7, 13, or 17 and are patentable over the cited prior art for at least the same reasons as set forth above with respect to claims 1, 7, 13, and 17. In addition, each of the dependent claims also recites combinations that are separately patentable.

In view of the foregoing remarks, this claimed invention, as amended, is not rendered obvious in view of the prior art references cited against this application. Applicant therefore requests the entry of this response, the Examiner's reconsideration and reexamination of the application, and the timely allowance of the pending claims.

In discussing the specification, claims, and drawings in this response, it is to be understood that Applicant in no way intends to limit the scope of the claims to any exemplary

embodiments described in the specification and/or shown in the drawings. Rather, Applicant is entitled to have the claims interpreted broadly, to the maximum extent permitted by statute, regulation, and applicable case law.

Except for issue fees payable under 37 C.F.R. § 1.18, the Commissioner is hereby authorized by this paper to charge any additional fees during the entire pendency of this application including fees due under 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.16 and 1.17 which may be required, including any required extension of time fees, or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 19-2380. This paragraph is intended to be a **CONSTRUCTIVE PETITION FOR EXTENSION OF TIME** in accordance with 37 C.F.R. § 1.136(a)(3).

Should the Examiner believe that a telephone conference would expedite issuance of the application, the Examiner is respectfully invited to telephone the undersigned patent agent at (202) 585-8316.

Respectfully submitted,

NIXON PEABODY, LLP

/Marc W. Butler, Reg. #50,219/
Marc W. Butler
Registration No. 50,219

NIXON PEABODY LLP
CUSTOMER NO.: 22204
401 9th Street, N.W., Suite 900
Washington, DC 20004
Tel: 202-585-8000
Fax: 202-585-8080